

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/029,401

Applicant(s)

CALL, HANS-PETER

Examiner

Joseph D. Anthony

Art Unit

1714

#15

All Participants:

(1) Joseph D. Anthony.

(2) Dalbert Shefte.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 4 May 2005

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Joe Anthony 5/4/05
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called telephone number (704) 331-7400 (which is the only telephone contact number presently listed in the PALM data base for the application) and spoke with Mr. Dalbert Shefte in an attempt to request an election to an oral restriction requirement being made by the examiner. Mr. Dalbert said he and his law firm have officially withdrawn as attorneys of record pursuant to the provisions of 37 CFR 10.40 filed 02/26/2002 and approved by the PTO on 03/23/2002. Since the file contains no other contact person except the inventor himself, Herr Hans-Peter Call, who lives in Germany, it was agreed that the best course of action would be for the examiner to send out a written restriction requirement and have it mailed to the inventor himself in Germany. If the written restriction is mistakenly mailed to Mr. Dalbert Shefte's law office, which should not happen since his Law Office is no longer listed in PALM as the attorney/agent for this application, Mr. Shefte kindly offered to make an attempt to forward the written restriction to applicant or his new representative (if known).